

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT



Application No. 13966, of the George Washington University, pursuant to Sub-section 8207.2 of the Zoning Regulations, for a special exception under Paragraph 3101.46 for further processing under an approved Campus Plan to permit construction of a University support building in an R-5-C District at premises 2007-29 F Street, N.W., (Square 103, Lot 38).

HEARING DATES: May 25 and June 29, 1983
DECISION DATE: September 7, 1983

FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. As a preliminary matter at the public hearing on May 25, 1983, the Board considered two motions by Advisory Neighborhood Commission 2A. The first motion was to continue the public hearing for approximately sixty days for the following reasons:

- a. George Washington University (GWU) had not been fully cooperative with the ANC;
- b. Because of the lack of cooperation, the ANC's ability to represent the interests of the community had been thwarted;
- c. There was the potential to develop practical alternative plans;
- d. The ANC had only been able to obtain counsel as of May 5, 1983;
- e. With the shortness of time, counsel was unable to adequately prepare the ANC's case and to assist in efforts to reach a compromise solution with the University;
- f. The ANC had been excluded from meaningful consultation and participation in the development of the University's proposal, but believed that a resolution of all problems could be reached if adequate time was made available for constructive discussions;
- g. The University had been uninterested in providing necessary information in a timely manner;

- h. The ANC had recently engaged a professional study team of attorneys, architects and planners which needed additional time to analyze pertinent information; and
- i. The continuance would serve the interest of the community and would not prejudice the interests of the University. The continuance would operate to the benefit of all concerned.

The motion for continuance was further supported by the letter of Councilman John Wilson, dated May 23, 1983, requesting that the public hearing be postponed for thirty days to allow for a broader community awareness of the actual functions of the proposed building and to allow time for the community and University to get together to accommodate legitimate concerns.

2. The applicant was opposed to the motion on the following grounds:

- a. The University had been in contact with various groups on seventeen different occasions dating back to June 10, 1982;
- b. The proposal is not a new project and is not a surprise to residents of the area;
- c. In June, 1982, the West End Citizens Association and the ANC appointed three persons from the community to meet with University officials; the committee examined three specific sites within the area designated by the campus plan and found the proposed site to meet the requirements of the plan;
- d. The proposed plan takes into account the issues raised by the community to the extent the University could accommodate them;
- e. The most recent plan presented by the community was found by the University to be impractical; the applicant informed the residents and the ANC it had no further interest in proceeding with negotiations; and
- f. The applicant believed that additional negotiations would not be productive and that no benefit would come from a delay.

The applicant further stated that the proposed design had been approved by the Commission of Fine Arts and that the applicant had a team of expert witnesses who could provide

testimony which will include the areas of noise and air quality.

3. The Board determined to proceed with the public hearing and stated that if it was necessary, the record would be left open to receive any additional information specified by the Board.

4. The second preliminary motion of Advisory Neighborhood Commission 2A requested the Board to waive the seven day filing requirement to receive into the record a supplemental report from the ANC. The ANC stated that because of time constraints, it was not able to file the supplemental report with its principal report which was filed timely. The applicant reviewed the supplemental report and did not object to its inclusion into the record. The Board waived the seven day filing requirements and accepted the supplemental report of the ANC into the record.

5. The subject site is located on the north side of F Street between 20th and 21st Streets, N.W. and is known as premises 2007-29 F Street, N.W. It is in an R-5-C District.

6. The site is rectangular in shape containing approximately 28,669 square feet with 237.5 feet of frontage on F Street. The site is presently used as a university parking lot for students, faculty and staff.

7. The site is abutted on the north by a sixteen foot wide public alley which runs east and west from 20th to 21st Streets.

8. Immediately east of the site, at the northwest corner of the intersection of 20th and F Streets, is a dormitory facility owned by the University. To the west is a structure used as an academic and office facility owned by the University. Further to the west, at the northeast corner of the intersection of 21st and F Streets and north along 21st Street immediately south of the east-west alley in the subject square, are residential row dwellings not owned by the University.

9. To the north of the site in the subject square, with frontage on E Street between 20th and 21st Streets, the University owns a majority of the properties, which are used as student parking lots and academic buildings. The non-University owned properties are occupied and owned by University chartered fraternities and sororities.

10. South of the site across F Street in the R-5-D District are eight to ten story apartment houses.

11. The George Washington University Campus Plan was approved by the Board under BZA Order No. 10403, dated

December 22, 1970. The Plan provides flexibility through emphasis on general policies for the location and character of proposed buildings.

12. George Washington University, made up of the Columbia College, the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences and six major professional schools, requires administrative support to carry out its academic and research programs. Approximately 25,000 people come to the campus daily. Effective support of this operation requires a facility to house both related support service elements and administrative elements.

13. The applicant proposes to construct a support building to address the future space needs of the University which requires a new support building to provide 70,000 to 75,000 square feet of space.

14. The Campus Plan has four designated use areas: core academic, peripheral, medical school-hospital and high value frontage. The subject site is located in the peripheral area which is designed for buildings requiring less student contact and accessibility. Although a parking garage is indicated in the illustrative plan for the subject site, it does not preclude development of the site for the proposed support building or other uses appropriate to the "peripheral" use category.

15. The applicant testified that in order to determine the most appropriate location for a support building, three available sites within the designated peripheral area of the campus were studied. A location in Square 42 at the corner of 24th and H Streets, N.W. was unacceptable because it was too small to accommodate essential functions including adequate vehicular access and loading dock space. A second site on Square 42 at the corner of 23rd and G Streets, N.W. was also unacceptable because its size, configuration and general location would require curb-cuts resulting in the loss of limited on-street parking, increased truck traffic on 23rd Street and also result in truck maneuvering on G Street that would disrupt local traffic. The subject site was selected due to its size and accessibility from an existing alley and because it will have a minimal impact on existing traffic on surrounding streets.

16. Currently, the University's support activities occur at locations throughout the campus. Consequently, vendor deliveries are made to the location of individual departments or programs. This causes disruptive on-campus vehicular traffic as vendors double park on streets to make deliveries. There is further a costly, inefficient and unwieldy administrative process for certifying proper deliveries and vendor payments. In addition, daily mail deliveries and receipt of certain plant maintenance/

custodial supplies are handled at facilities lacking loading dock and material handling (elevator and fork lift) support. The University transportation support function is without any reasonable service accommodations.

17. The proposed support building will contain 30,000 square feet of gross floor area and will provide a central location for support activities including mail service, grounds care, transportation, housekeeping, emergency facility maintenance and University supply-material receiving and issue functions. Service space will also be provided for University vehicles as well as space for short term storage of non-medical supplies. Parking for forty-four student, faculty and staff automobiles will be accommodated. The proposed height of the building is forty-six feet and it will occupy forty-six percent of the lot.

18. The hours of operation will be from 7:30 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. on weekdays. The Housekeeping Department also works a night shift from 10:00 P.M. to 7:00 A.M.

19. The proposed structure is designed to ensure adequate vehicular access and loading dock capacity. The structure was also designed to minimize the noise generated in the service area and at the loading dock, which is located at the rear of the structure. The service yard is buffered by the structure which is constructed of reinforced concrete and masonry and will be sixty feet in depth at the loading dock. The second floor of the structure will overhang the service yard by approximately twenty-eight feet, which will further contain any noise generated by service activities.

20. Insulated interior and exterior masonry walls, and small double-glazed windows will be used to contain noises generated within the structure. The roof will also be heavily insulated.

21. The structure is designed to visually screen the service yard from the neighborhood. The building immediately to the west of the site is owned by the University. It has a forty-foot high blank masonry wall facing the site extending from the front building line to the alley. Immediately to the east and north sides of the service yard, a masonry wall will be constructed at a minimum height of eight feet. A sliding gate will provide access to the alley from the service yard. The gate will have a minimum height of eight feet and will be designed to block visibility when it is closed. The proposed structure itself will block any of the service yard from the highest windows in the apartment buildings on the south side of F Street.

22. The structural design of the building is such that vertical expansion may occur to the building in the future. Such expansion would require the further review and approval of this Board.

23. The site will be landscaped with emphasis on the F Street frontage. The nineteen foot strip of land between the sidewalk and building line will be bermed up and landscaped. This feature is similar to the townhouses to the west of the site. Trees will be planted immediately east of the proposed structure at the service yard wall, to further screen the service yard from view.

24. Mechanical systems of the structure will be designed with consideration for energy conservation and air quality.

25. Facilities will be provided for the handicapped. A ramp in the front yard provides access to elevators at the first basement level. On the service yard side, access is by freight elevators at the yard level.

26. The structure will be architecturally designed to be compatible with adjacent and nearby buildings. The structure will relate in scale and massing with the adjacent townhouse structures and will present a coherent facade to the neighborhood along the north side of F Street.

27. The existing curb cut and wall opening to the present parking lot from F Street will be relocated further east to serve the smaller forty-four space car lot. Public parking on F Street will not be reduced.

28. Three loading docks are provided, as well as two freight elevators that stop at the service yard. These elevators are large enough to handle the electric carts which are loaded inside the building.

29. Mr. Michael Staiano, a noise expert, testified that he took measurements of the level of noise at five locations around the subject site and at the various activities around the campus that are proposed to be relocated to the support services building. The noise measurements were performed from 7:00 to 10:00 A.M. and from 5:00 to 6:00 P.M. Mr. Staiano found that the support building and related trash trucks will comply with the D.C. noise control law requirements and that the noise level of the proposed building will be lower than the existing level. He also stated that the rooftop mounted ventilation equipment will maintain the building's conformance with the D.C. requirements. He further stressed that much of the noise presently at the site is generated by the vehicles that enter and exit the existing parking lot. He indicated that the reduction in size of the parking lot will not only reduce the vehicular

traffic in the area but will reduce the noise levels as well. The Board finds that the impact on existing noise levels would not be objectionable.

30. The applicant's transportation expert, Mr. John Callow, made a complete study that focused on the actual uses programmed for the support building. The consultant found that the impact of the building upon the street system will be positive because consolidation of the University support function into one building will reduce the number of trips on the street system. Delivery trucks will no longer have to double park their vehicles and there will be less idling of engines due to double parking. The actual number of truck trips being generated by the building would be very light, with an average of ninety-two vehicle trips per day, mostly outside of the normal peak periods. This is less than the current number of trips. The support building site will provide parking for forty-four student, faculty and staff automobiles and seventeen service vehicles. The service vehicle spaces will be located in the rear of the building with access from the existing alley and will be screened from the adjacent owners. The service bays and loading docks will be secured with garage doors. Automobile traffic to and from Square 103 will be reduced because eighty spaces from the existing 124 space parking lot will be eliminated from Square 103. Forty-four spaces will be relocated to Square 101. A net decrease of thirty-six automobile parking spaces from the University's inventory is proposed, which will decrease the total number of trips by 144 per day. The expansion of Metro accessibility of the University to the suburbs will reduce the dependency on the automobile in the future. The Board concurs with the findings of the transportation expert.

31. The approved Campus Plan requires the applicant to provide 2700 to 3000 parking spaces. The total number of spaces provided if the proposed building is constructed would be 2,782. Further, additional spaces are provided for casual parkers at the Kennedy Center in conjunction with a shuttle service.

32. Mr. Ned Studholme, an air quality expert for the applicant, testified that he made a study of four factors relating to air quality: stationary emissions, mobile source emissions from vehicles on campus, mobile source emissions from vehicles on the site with and without the project, and short term impact during construction. Mr. Studholme found that stationary emissions will decrease overall because the proposed support building will replace older buildings and will be three times more efficient. He also predicted a reduction in mobile source emissions on campus and mobile source emissions on the site, because the elimination of parking spaces will result in less vehicular traffic, the present facilities will be consolidated and seven gasoline

operated trucks will be replaced by electric operated carts. The Board concurs with the findings of the expert witness.

33. The floor area ratio for the campus including projects presently under construction within the residential districts is 2.17. The proposed service facility will increase the F.A.R. to 2.19. A maximum F.A.R. of 3.5 is allowed.

34. The R-5-C District allows a maximum height of ninety feet. Forty-six feet is provided. A lot occupancy of seventy-five percent is allowed. Forty-six percent is provided. A rear yard of fifteen feet is required and 32.7 feet is provided, exclusive of the building overhang at the rear. The height, bulk, area and setback of the proposed structure are within the requirements of the Zoning Regulations.

35. The proposed University support building will not cause an increase in the present student population of 17,000. The adopted campus plan calls for a maximum student population of 17,000.

36. College and universities are permitted by special exception in the R-5-C District, pursuant to Paragraph 3101.46. The applicant is requesting further processing under its approved campus plan to construct the proposed support facility.

37. The proposed design of the support facility has concept approval from the Commission of Fine Arts.

38. The Office of Planning, by report dated May 18, 1983, recommended conditional approval of the application. The Office of Planning was of the opinion that the proposed support building was consistent with the approved campus plan and the site in question was acceptable for the proposed use. The Office of Planning reported that the campus plan was a policy plan, which associated certain policies and kinds of uses with various areas of the campus. The plan describes an area, on the edge of the campus including the subject site as a peripheral area, suitable for the location of such uses as dormitories, administrative offices, athletic facilities and parking facilities. In the opinion of the Office of Planning, the site is appropriate for all but medical school activities, academic core activities and high-value frontage activities.

39. The Office of Planning found that the Illustrative Site Plan of the approved Campus Plan suggested a parking garage for the subject location, but that that facility is no longer required, given the University's current policy to place all future permanent parking under new buildings. This change is not likely to have a significant impact on

the integrity of the plan, but does serve to free up land for the proposed support building which is expected to consolidate 30,000 square feet of the 72,700 square feet of centralized support services defined in the approved Campus Plan.

40. The Office of Planning further reported that while it generally shares the community's goal of increased residential activity in the Foggy Bottom area and its concern about protecting large residential concentrations, the subject building on this site is reasonable even if not ideal, and one in which impacts can be ameliorated for the program which is the basis for this application. The Office of Planning was of the opinion that truck maintenance, compactor operation and truck activity generally are projected to have a minimal impact on existing noise levels in the area, given the configuration of the building and the truck parking/loading area. Truck traffic will not significantly impact existing traffic or air quality in the area and should improve both campus wide. Visually, the building is designed to fit into the community and shield the truck activities from adjacent F Street residents on the south. A properly designed gate would do much the same from the north. In the opinion of the Office of Planning, the proposed project meets the requirements of Paragraph 3101.46 of the Zoning Regulations and was recommended for approval subject to the following conditions which would tend to reduce any impacts on adjoining property:

1. Truck dock activity should not occur between the hours of 4:30 P.M. and 8:30 A.M.
2. There should be no truck queuing permitted in the alley.
3. Truck maintenance should not be expanded to include truck repair.
4. Compactor operation should not occur between the hours of 4:30 P.M. and 8:30 A.M.
5. The security gate for the truck parking/loading area should be opaque in design and a minimum of eight feet in height to screen truck activity from potential viewers on grade north of the site.

The Board concurs with the reasoning and recommendation of the Office of Planning.

41. The D.C. Department of Transportation (DOT), by memorandum dated May 18, 1983, reported that the proposal will produce no measurable adverse impact on the surrounding street system provided that all truck traffic is

required to use the existing alley with no access to or from F Street.

42. The D.C. DOT reported that:

- A. 20th Street is a minor arterial, with an average daily traffic volume of 11,100 vehicles near the site. The street is thirty-two feet wide, and runs one-way northbound. On the east side, two-hour metered parking is permitted between 9:30 A.M. and 6:30 P.M. On the west side, parking is prohibited at all times.
- B. 21st Street is a local street, with an average daily traffic volume of 7,100 vehicles near the site. 21st Street is thirty-two feet wide, and runs one-way southbound. Two-hour metered parking is permitted from 7:00 A.M. to 4:00 P.M. on the west side of the street. Residential permit parking is allowed on the east side.
- C. F Street is a local street, with an average daily traffic volume of 3,000 vehicles near the site. F Street is thirty-eight feet wide, and runs one-way eastbound. Residential permit parking is permitted on both sides of the street.
- D. G Street is a thirty-six foot wide local street. It runs one-way westbound, with an average daily traffic volume of 4,400 vehicles near the site. Two-hour metered parking is permitted between 7:00 A.M. and 6:30 P.M. on both sides of G Street.

43. The D.C. Department of Transportation was further of the opinion that the three proposed loading berths will be adequate to accommodate the project, given the estimated level of activity, and that there is ample maneuvering room to approach and leave the bay via the public alley. The D.C. DOT was also of the opinion that the use of the alley would not require any new curb cuts on 20th or 21st Streets. The D.C. DOT did not anticipate that the project would affect measurably the level of service on the adjacent street system, nor cause congestion in the public alley. A positive result of the proposal, DOT believed, would be to eliminate the need for trucks to double-park on public streets. Also, the consolidation of the University support functions into one building may reduce the total number of service-related trips in the George Washington University area. Finally, the project will eliminate thirty of the 124 parking spaces which the site presently contains. There will be forty-four spaces adjacent to the support building but physically separated from it by a wall. Entrance to and exit from this lot will be from F Street. All truck and delivery vehicles approaching and leaving the site should be

restricted to alley access from 20th and 21st Streets. The Board concurs with the reasoning and recommendation of the D.C. Department of Transportation.

44. A resident of 2145 F Street, N.W. testified in support of the application, stating that the proposed facility would not effect residences across F Street since the ANC is presenting an alternative which proposes housing next to the proposed support building.

45. Five letters in support of the application were received into the record from neighborhood residents who stated that: (A) neighborhood concerns had been considered by the University; (B) the University is an asset to the community; (C) efforts by the University to operate effectively should be supported; and (D) the proposed design and scale of the support building is compatible with the community.

46. The West End Citizens Association, the Letterman House Unit Owners Association, the Fraternity Housing Association, Inc., and residents from the community testified in opposition to the application. Forty letters from neighborhood residents were filed objecting to the facility. The grounds for the opposition were as follows:

- A. The residential character of F Street should be retained;
- B. The proposed facility is incompatible with the neighborhood;
- C. The building will generate noise and air pollution;
- D. The building will exacerbate truck traffic on residential streets;
- E. The building will exacerbate an already existing on-street parking problem;
- F. Trash will create unsanitary conditions; and
- G. A safety problem will be created for pedestrians.

The Board does not concur with the views of the opposition. The Board finds that truck traffic will be minimal on residential streets and that truck access to the facility will be by way of the public alley in the square. The proposed design and scale of the structure is harmonious with the residential character of F Street. Noise and air pollution will be minimal because of the exceptional insulation, and self-contained nature of the proposed design.

47. Advisory Neighborhood Commission 2A, by report dated May 16, 1983, voted to oppose the application on the following basis:

- A. The ANC recommended that the BZA require GWU to conduct a more thorough site selection analysis to determine whether there are alternative locations, within the campus master plan area or elsewhere in the City, for the location of the support building which will not have an adverse impact on residents and to require GWU to review with the ANC the plan proposed by the ANC for alternate development of the site including residential development fronting on F and G Streets, N.W.
- B. The ANC recommended that the BZA require a fuller study of the traffic impact of the proposed development and allow the ANC a period of sixty days to determine the nature and likely effect of the traffic to be generated by the support center. The ANC was of the opinion that particular emphasis should be given to the effect on the neighbors of the site, as contrasted to the effect on GWU, of the proposed development.
- C. The ANC was of the view that a superior alternative for development of the property would be the location of medium density residential units fronting on F Street and G Street at the subject site, with the location of the support building in the central portion of the square, providing that the existing through alley be closed, so that the building may occupy that site. The ANC submitted two conceptual site plans prepared by David Schwartz/Architectural Services, P.C., showing two alternate methods of proposed development, which include residential development. The ANC recognized that the economic feasibility of this method of development must be explored and developer interest in the project generated. Based on conversations with architects familiar with the development process, the ANC believed that such interest can be generated within a sixty-day period. Accordingly, the ANC recommended to the BZA and requested that the hearing on the pending application be deferred for a period of approximately sixty days, so that the ANC can varify the level of developer interest in the development alternative it recommended.
- D. The ANC recommended that the BZA find that the development proposed by GWU is likely to have a detrimental and objectionable effect on residents in the neighborhood by the elimination of a site

with residential development potential, by the creation of additional heavy traffic in an area containing many residential units, and by the danger associated with a garage/maintenance/storage facility, such as will be included within the GWU support center.

- E. The ANC recommended that the BZA require GWU to revise and update its Campus Master Plan so as to indicate the nature of presently anticipated development within the area defined in the Master Plan. The ANC was of the opinion that only through such a process can the full impact of locating the support center in the requested site be ascertained.

48. The ANC presented James Clark, former acting Director of the D.C. Department of Transportation, as an expert witness in the areas of transportation planning and traffic impacts. Mr. Clark testified that the University master plan was defective in not giving more detail of the proposed facility. The alternative sites identified by the University lacked a clear set of standards for selecting a site. Site selection is important because of the uniqueness of the proposed facility. Mr. Clark was of the opinion that the applicant understated the traffic generated by the proposed facility based on the number of vehicles to be parked on the site and other types of vehicles traveling to and from the site. Mr. Clark felt that the number of trips per day would be at least five times what the University stated. He indicated that a lot of information would be needed to determine the number of trips. The analysis made by the University was difficult to follow. Mr. Clark supported the effort and method of analysis undertaken by the ANC to determine the number of trips to the site. Mr. Clark further testified he was concerned that the truck traffic generated would be traveling outside of the peak hours in residential areas and there is need for genuine traffic control to lessen the impact on residential streets such as F Street. One way to restrict truck travel to certain streets is to make the alley one-way.

49. The Board is required by statute to give "great weight" to the issues and concerns of an ANC that are reduced to writing. In response to the ANC's written issues and concerns, as set forth in its report with exhibits and attachments, the Board makes the following findings:

- A. The applicant has conducted a satisfactory site election process. The Board finds that the proposed site is the most appropriate. It conforms with the approved campus plan and has adequate size and accessibility posing the least impact on the residential community. The Board

further finds that the alternate development schemes proposed by the ANC are not properly before it. The applicant is not seeking a use variance. The applicant has no burden to show that the site can or cannot be used for residential purposes. The Board finds that any further delay would benefit no one and that the record was left open for specific information requested by the Board.

- B. As a result of the traffic analysis prepared by the Department of Transportation, the applicant and the ANC, the Board finds that the consolidation of truck activity will not adversely affect the neighborhood since it will be screened from residences, the applicant does not propose to use F Street as a point of ingress and egress for truck deliveries, the level of activity will not change existing traffic conditions and will not burden the existing alley system, and that there is sufficient dock time available to meet peak demand.
- C. The proposed support building will not likely have a detrimental or objectionable effect on residents in the neighborhood by the elimination of a site with residential development potential. Traffic impacts would be minimized on the surrounding street system due to the consolidation of support activities of the University. The facility is so designed as to minimize noise and air pollution to adjoining or nearby properties. The design of the facility is in keeping with the character of the neighborhood.
- D. The Board concurs with the ANC that the GWU campus master plan should be revised and updated to indicate more definitively the nature of anticipated development in the Plan area. This will be so ordered below.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND OPINION:

Based on the foregoing findings of fact and the evidence of record, the Board concludes that the applicant is seeking a special exception, the granting of which requires compliance with Paragraph 3101.46 of the Zoning Regulations. The Board concludes that the support building is consistent with the approved Campus Plan. The Board concludes that the proposed support facility is so located that it is not likely to become objectionable to neighboring property owners because of noise, traffic, number of students, air quality or other objectionable conditions. The Board further concludes that the proposed building, when

added to all existing buildings and structures within residential zones, does not exceed the gross floor area prescribed for the R-5-C District. The Board concludes that the applicant has met its burden of proof.

The Board further concludes that the relief can be granted as in harmony with the general intent and purpose of the Zoning Regulations and will not tend to affect adversely the use of neighboring property. The Board further concludes that it has accorded to the ANC the "great weight" to which it is entitled.

The Board is mindful of the concerns of the Advisory Neighborhood Commission regarding the status of the existing University campus plan, approved by the Board. Based on observations made in this case and in a series of other special exception applications from the University, the Board is of the opinion that the University should prepare and submit a revised campus plan for consideration by and approval of the Board. The Plan was approved in 1970. Much has happened since that time to raise questions concerning the fundamental assumptions that underly the plan. The Board has considered any number of applications indicating that at least the illustrative site plan is very much out of date. Not only has the University changed, but the area surrounding the campus on which the University impacts has also changed. The Board further notes that the process for preparation, review and approval of campus plans has become considerably more sophisticated since 1970. The plan itself and the Board's Order approving the plan are both in need of updating, refinement and improvement.

Accordingly, it is ORDERED that the application is GRANTED SUBJECT to the following CONDITIONS:

1. Truck dock activities shall not occur between the hours of 4:30 P.M. and 8:30 A.M. excluding mail pick-up and delivery which occurs on a normal basis outside of those hours and emergency situations.
2. There shall be no truck queuing permitted in the public alley.
3. The security gate for the truck parking and loading area shall be a minimum of eight feet in height and opaque in design to screen truck activity.
4. Truck maintenance activities shall be limited to normal maintenance.
5. Trash compactor operation shall not occur between the hours of 4:30 P.M. and 7:30 A.M.

It is further hereby ORDERED that George Washington University prepare and submit to the Board within eighteen months from the date of this Order, a revised campus plan for the University, to update the campus plan last approved by the Board in 1970.

VOTE: 4-1 (Carrie L. Thornhill, William F. McIntosh, Walter B. Lewis and Charles R. Norris to grant; Douglas J. Patton opposed to motion).

BY ORDER OF THE D.C. BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

ATTESTED BY:


STEVEN E. SHER
Executive Director

FINAL DATE OF ORDER:

DEC 30 1983

UNDER SUB-SECTION 8204.3 OF THE ZONING REGULATIONS, "NO DECISION OR ORDER OF THE BOARD SHALL TAKE EFFECT UNTIL TEN DAYS AFTER HAVING BECOME FINAL PURSUANT TO THE SUPPLEMENTAL RULES OF PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE BEFORE THE BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT."

THIS ORDER OF THE BOARD IS VALID FOR A PERIOD OF SIX MONTHS AFTER THE EFFECTIVE DATE OF THIS ORDER, UNLESS WITHIN SUCH PERIOD AN APPLICATION FOR A BUILDING PERMIT OR CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY IS FILED WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS.

13966order/LINDA3